

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants amended claim 2 to correct a grammatical error. Applicants amended claim 22 to change the dependency to claim 21, the network claim. Applicants further amended claim 25 to add a period at the end of the sentence.

1. Amended Claims 31-37 Comply with the Requirements of 35 U.S.C. §101

The Examiner found that claims 31-37 are directed to non-statutory subject matter (35 U.S.C. §101 on the grounds the computer program can be embodied within a non-tangible medium. (Third Office Action, pg. 2)

Applicants amended independent claim 31 as the Examiner suggested to recite a “computer readable storage medium” to overcome the Section 101 rejection. Applicants further amended claim 31 to recite that the claim is directed to the “computer readable storage medium” including the code executed by a manager system.

Applicants amended claims 32-37 to recite the “computer readable storage medium”.

2. Claims 1-11 and 13-17 are Patentable Over the Cited Art

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 4-9, and 21-36 as anticipated by Weber (U.S. Patent No. 6,480,901). Applicants traverse for the following reasons.

Claim 1 recites system in communication with a network comprising one or more storage devices and one or more hosts via a switching fabric component, wherein application processes reside on the hosts, wherein the application processes configure and manage the hosts in which the application processes execute, and further require: a manager in communication with the switching fabric component and hosts in the network; and an interface process in communication with the manager, a switching fabric component, and the hosts, wherein the interface process performs: obtaining information on hosts and the switching fabric component in the network from the manager; displaying information representing the hosts and switching fabric component in the network; displaying information on application processes associated with the represented hosts and switching fabric component in the network; receiving selection of one of the displayed application processes; launching the selected application process residing on the represented hosts or switching fabric component.

The Examiner cited col. 13, lines 1-49 and col. 16, lines 58-67 of Weber as disclosing the claim requirement of displaying information on application processes associated with the represented hosts and switching fabric component in the network. (Third Office Action, pg. 4)

The cited col. 13 discusses a discover-monitor application screen having a management domain window presenting a tree view of the management domain. Lower level nodes in the tree represent actually physical hardware devices such as servers, arrays, and other I/O devices. The higher level nodes in the tree represent the location of the hardware devices, such as state and city. A detailed information window presents detailed properties for each device. If a device is selected, the device's management interface application program is launched.

The cited col. 13 discusses a display of hardware devices in the network and their properties. Nowhere does the cited col. 13 anywhere disclose displaying information on application processes associated with the represented hosts and switching fabric component in the network. Claim 1 further recites that this application processes reside on the represented hosts or switching fabric component. Nowhere does the cited col. 13 anywhere disclose displaying information on application processes residing on the network devices. Instead, the cited col. 13 discusses displaying information on the device and launching a device management interface application for a displayed device. However, there is no disclosure in the cited col. 13 of displaying information on application processes associated with the represented hosts and switching fabric component in the network.

The cited col. 16 discusses starting a management interface application for a storage system in the network by the user clicking one of the storage systems. The device property information about the selected storage system is received. The cited col. 16 further mentions that the management application is associated with that device. Applicants submit that claim 1 distinguishes from the cited col. 16 because claim 1 requires that the displayed application process, which may also be selected and launched, resided on the represented hosts or switching fabric component. The cited management application of col. 16, although associated with the device, does not reside on the device as claimed.

In fact, Weber mentions that the management interface application program for a device is loaded and run on the management station 802 (Weber, col. 17, lines 3-7), and does not reside on not the represented host or switching fabric component in the network. Weber further emphasizes this distinction in discussing how the management interface application passes a

change request to a handler, so that the request is sent in a UTM packet and transmitted to the controller of the device, which processes the change request and sends a status update back to the management interface application. (Weber, col. 17, lines 41-50). Thus, the cited management interface application does not reside on the represented network device as claimed, but is executed by the management station to manage the device remotely.

Thus, the cited cols. 13 and 16 do not disclose displaying information on application processes that reside on the represented external device, e.g., host or switching fabric component.

The Examiner cited col. 13, lines 1-49 and col. 7, lines 25-39 as disclosing the claim requirement of launching the selected application process residing on the represented hosts or switching fabric component. (Third Office Action, pg. 4) Applicants traverse.

As discussed, the cited col. 13 discusses a user interface displaying information on devices in a network and launching a management interface application program to manage a device. Further, although the cited management interface application is associated with the device which it is used to manage, the cited management interface application program does not reside on the remote device as claimed. Instead, the cited management interface application program runs on the management station and interacts with the device remotely. (See, Weber, col. 17, lines 3-50). Thus, the discussion in the cited col. 13 of launching the management interface application program concerns a program on the management station used to manage a network device, not launching a selected program that resides on the host or switching fabric component as claimed.

The cited col. 7 discusses how the management station 206, as shown in FIG. 3, uses information on a particular device 204-1....204-N to determine a management application 214 residing in a local storage 210 of the management station 206 to use to manage the device. The retrieved management application 214 then performs the functionality to manage, monitor and configure the particular device and is configured to communicate with and direct the controller and control software of the associated device. Thus, in the cited col. 7 the cited management application that is used to manage the remote device resides on the storage of the management station and is run on the management station. Nowhere does the cited col. 7 anywhere disclose launching displayed application processes that reside on the network host or switching fabric component.

Nowhere does the cited Weber anywhere disclose the claim requirements of displaying information on application processes associated with hosts and switching fabrics in a network, where the application processes reside on the hosts and switching fabric, and then launching the selected application process residing on the represented host or switching fabric.

Accordingly, claim 1 is patentable over the cited art because the cited Weber does not disclose all the claim requirements.

Claims 2 and 4-9 are patentable over the cited art because they depend from claim 1. Further, the below discussed dependent claims provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art.

Claim 2 further requires a graphical output device coupled to the interface process for displaying one or more graphical objects each representing one of the application processes on the hosts and switching component and the interface process being coupled to the graphical output device for effecting the display of the graphical objects on the graphical output device.

The Examiner cited col. 13, lines 1-67, col. 4, lines 34-51 and FIG. 6, col. 9, lines 10-42 as disclosing the additional requirements of claim 2. (Third Office Action, pg. 5) Applicants traverse.

As discussed, the cited col. 13 discusses displaying information on network devices. The cited col. 4 discusses device specific management applications and a user interface that is used to manage all I/O devices in a network. The devices in the network are displayed as a result of a discovery process. For each managed device type, there is a unique management application that is loaded. The cited col. 9 and FIG. 6 discusses the operations of the management station to discover devices, maintain an association of discovered devices and the specific management interface application program for the devices, and providing a user interface for invoking the management interface application program for a particular device.

Although the cited Weber discusses managing network devices using a management interface application program, which is maintained and run locally from the management station, nowhere does the cited Weber anywhere disclose displaying objects representing application processes on the hosts or switching fabric component, where the represented application is launched. Instead, the cited Weber discusses operations and applications that are local to the management station and displaying representations of remote devices. However, there is no

disclosure of displaying graphical objects representing application processes and launching such application processes that reside on the host or switching fabric component.

Accordingly, claim 2 provides additional grounds of patentability over the cited art because the additional requirements of claim 2 are not disclosed in the cited Weber.

Claim 4 depends from claim 2 and further requires that the interface process responds to selection of one of the objects representing one application process by effecting execution of the application process represented by that object.

The Examiner cited col. 13, lines 1-49 and col. 14, lines 10-15 of Weber as disclosing the additional requirements of claim 4. (Third Office Action, pg. 5) Applicants traverse.

As discussed, the cited col. 13 discusses displaying information on network devices. The cited col. 14 mentions that when the user selects and opens a particular device from the screen, the management application interface program for that device is loaded into the management station. The claim requires that the launched application process reside in the host or switching fabric component. The cited cols. 13 and 14 discuss how to run a management application program from a management station. Nowhere do the cited cols. 13 and 14 anywhere disclose the claim requirement that selection of an object executes an application process residing on a host or switching component in a network.

Accordingly, claim 4 provides additional grounds of patentability over the cited art because the additional requirement of claim 2 is not disclosed in the cited Weber.

Claim 5 depends from claim 4 and further requires a store containing information regarding one or more hosts and the switching component and one or more application processes residing on selected hosts and the switching component.

The Examiner cited col. 2, lines 26-36 of Weber as disclosing the additional requirements of these claims. (Third Office Action, pg. 5)

The cited col. 2 mentions a storage for storing a device management application program associated with a managed device and a management station in communication with the managed device. The management station retrieves the device management application program from the storage and processes the application to monitor and manage the device.

Nowhere does the cited col. 2 anywhere disclose the claim requirements that a store contains information on application processes residing in hosts and a switching component in a network. Instead, the management application programs in the cited Weber reside in a storage of

the management station, which, as discussed, Weber mentions is a local storage for the management station.

Accordingly, claim 5 provides additional grounds of patentability over the cited art because the additional requirements of claim 5 are not disclosed in the cited Weber.

Claim 6 recites that the interface process accesses the store, upon selection of one graphical object representing one host or the switching component to identify at least one application process residing on the host or switching component represented by the selected object.

The Examiner cited col. 14, lines 10-15 and col. 13, lines 1-49 of Weber as disclosing the additional requirements of these claims. (Third Office Action, pg. 5)

As discussed, the cited col. 13 discusses displaying information on network devices. The cited col. 14 mentions that when the user selects and opens a particular device from the screen, the management application interface program for that device is loaded into the management station. The claim requires that the launched application process reside in the host or switching fabric component. Nowhere do the cited cols. 13 and 14 anywhere disclose the claim requirement that the interface process accesses the store, upon selection of one graphical object representing one host or the switching component, to identify at least one application process residing on the host or switching component represented by the selected object. Instead, the management interface application program of the cited Weber does not reside on the host or switching fabric component as claimed, but a local storage for the management station.

Accordingly, claim 6 provides additional grounds of patentability over the cited art because the additional requirements of claim 6 are not disclosed in the cited Weber.

Applicants submit that independent claims 21, 24, and 31 are patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed with respect to amended claim 1. Claims 22, 23; 25-30, and 32-36 are patentable over the cited art because they depend from one of the independent claims 21, 24, and 31.

Moreover, claims 22, 25, and 32 are patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed with respect to 2; claims 23, 26, and 33 are patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed with respect to claim 4; claims 27 and 34 are patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed with respect to 5; claims 28 and 36 are patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed with respect to 8; claims 29 and 35 are patentable over the cited art for the

reasons discussed with respect to claim 6; and claim 30 is patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed with respect to claim 7.

Conclusion

For all the above reasons, Applicant submits that the pending claims 1, 2, 4-9, and 21-36 are patentable over the art of record. Applicants submit that no additional fee is needed. Nonetheless, should any additional fees be required, please charge Deposit Account No. 09-0466.

The attorney of record invites the Examiner to contact him at (310) 553-7977 if the Examiner believes such contact would advance the prosecution of the case.

Dated: June 16, 2006

By: /David Victor/

David W. Victor
Registration No. 39,867

Please direct all correspondences to:

David Victor
Konrad Raynes & Victor, LLP
315 South Beverly Drive, Ste. 210
Beverly Hills, CA 90212
Tel: 310-553-7977
Fax: 310-556-7984